

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the reasons that follow. Claims 1-47 and 54-59 are withdrawn from consideration, and claims 48-53 are respectfully presented for reconsideration.

Claims 48-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Kindrick (USP 6,065,251). Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the following reason.

Claim 48 defines a child seat “wherein the base and the backrest are pivotally connected by a connection mechanism that includes a plurality of hooks engaged with a bar” and “wherein the curved surface of at least one of the hooks opposes the curved surface of at least two of the other hooks.”

The Office Action admits that Kindrick fails to show at least one hook opposing the curved surface of at least two other hooks. The Office Action then states, however, that “[i]t would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have at least one of the hooks opposing the curved surface of at least two of the other hooks, since applicant has not disclosed that having at least one of the hooks opposing the curved surface of at least two of the other hooks solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with all the hooks facing the same way.”

In fact, orienting the hooks so that the curved surface of at least one hook opposes the curved surfaces of at least two of the other hooks, as defined in claim 48, does solve a particular problem and enables the child seat to work better than those seats with hooks facing the same way. As explained at paragraph [0070] of the application, conventional child seats do not include oppositely facing hooks. Rather, in conventional child seats that have hooks, the hooks face the same direction. When the backrest and the seat base of these conventional child seats rotate away from each other, as can occur when the child seat is lifted to move it, the hooks can slip off of the seat base, causing the backrest and the seat base to separate inadvertently. For example, when the child seat is lifted by its backrest, the seat base can rotate 90

degrees into alignment with the backrest. In this position, hooks that face the same direction can slip off the seat base. The child seat of claim 48 solves this problem. In order to fully separate the backrest from the seat base, the backrest must be rotated to a position approximately 180 degrees relative to the normal use position shown in FIG. 1. The backrest does not rotate naturally to this position relative to the seat base when the child seat is lifted to move it. Rather, the backrest only rotates 180 degrees relative to the normal use position when rotated with deliberateness. Therefore, the orientation of the hooks of the child seat of claim 48 prevents the backrest from inadvertently separating from the seat base when the two are aligned, as can occur in conventional child seats. For at least this reason, applicants traverse the rejection of claims 48-53 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Applicants have amended FIGS. 5 and 6 to rotate these figures 180 degrees. The orientation of FIGS. 5 and 6 is now consistent with that of FIG. 3. The attached Replacement Sheet incorporates these changes.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

If fees are due in connection with the filing of this response and no proper payment is enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If an

extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is required and has not been accounted for, such extension is hereby requested and the fee should be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-0741

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 16, 2003

By Mary Michelle Kile

FOLEY & LARDNER  
Customer Number: 22428



22428

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Telephone: (202) 672-5349  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Mary Michelle Kile  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 35,217